

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 remain in the application. No amendments are being made in this paper. Claims 1 and 5 are the only independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The independent claims stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by the Ferstenberg reference (U.S. Pat. No. 5,873,071).

Claim 1 is directed to a “method for transaction management and processing in a trading environment”. The claimed method includes “providing an Order Management System for receiving Orders” and “processing Orders, by way of said Order Management System”. Claim 1 further recites that the processing of Orders further includes “providing each of the Orders with a respective session” and “providing Orders from an Order Management System to an Exchange”. In addition, the processing of Orders also includes “providing transaction information for Orders from an Exchange to an Order Management System”. Still further, claim 1 specifies that “said Order Management System comprises components selected from the group comprising: at least two cooperating services, in-memory cache, and client API”.

Applicants believe that the key difference between applicant’s position and that of the Examiner boils down to whether the Ferstenberg reference satisfies the claim limitation of providing each order with a respective session. Moreover, since for present purposes the Examiner seems to be relying on the passage at column 40, line 55 to column 41, line 10 in Ferstenberg as allegedly disclosing this claim limitation, the relevant inquiry is as to whether this feature is described in that passage. In applicants’ view, the passage does not support the Examiner’s reliance thereon.

The cited passage of the reference states that a separate session is to be provided for each client access request, but the passage does not specify that each order during a client access is to receive a separate session. Nothing in this passage would prevent multiple orders from being submitted and processed during a single session. Thus nothing in the passage teaches or suggests the claim limitation of providing a separate session for each order.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The above remarks are also applicable to claim 5, which is the only other independent claim.

The other pending rejections are not believed to raise any issues that require discussion at this time.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

September<sup>13</sup>, 2006  
Date



---

Nathaniel Levin  
Registration No. 34,860  
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC  
Five Elm Street  
New Canaan, CT 06840  
(203) 972-3460